



**Agricultural Land Commission**  
133-4940 Canada Way  
Burnaby, British Columbia V5G 4K6  
Tel: 604 660-7000  
Fax: 604 660-7033  
www.alc.gov.bc.ca

November 23, 2007

Reply to the attention of Simone Rivers  
ALC File: D-37706

Brad Wiles  
PO Box 4665  
Quesnel, BC V2J3J9

Dear Mr. Wiles:

**Re: Application to Subdivide land in the Agricultural Land Reserve**

Please find attached the Minutes of Resolution # 599/2007 outlining the Commission's decision as it relates to the above noted application. As agent, it is your responsibility to notify your client(s) accordingly.

Yours truly,

PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

Per:

  
Erik Karlsen, Chair

cc: Cariboo Regional District (4035-20-B278)

Enclosure: Minutes/



## MINUTES OF THE PROVINCIAL AGRICULTURAL LAND COMMISSION

---

A meeting was held by the Provincial Agricultural Land Commission on November 7, 2007 at Quesnel City Hall, Quesnel B.C.

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Grant Huffman	Chair, Interior Panel
	Holly Campbell	Commissioner
	Gordon Gillette	Commissioner
	Simone Rivers	Staff

### For Consideration

Application:	# D- 37706
Applicant:	Robert & Nicole Zappone
Agent:	Brad Wiles
Proposal:	To subdivide the 235 ha property into a 44 lot subdivision. Lot sizes range from 34.1 ha to 2.2 ha in size.
Legal:	PID: 015-225-097 District Lot 3363, Cariboo District
Location:	Nazko Road - 1 km south of Bouchie Lake near Quesnel

### Site Inspection

A site inspection was conducted on November 7, 2007. Those in attendance were:

- Grant Huffman                      Chair, Interior Panel
- Holly Campbell                    Commissioner
- Gordon Gillette                   Commissioner
- Simone Rivers                     Staff
- Brad Wiles                         Agent for the applicants
- Robert and Nicole Zappone     Applicants

The Commission met with the applicants at the property. The applicants had recently purchased the property and wished to subdivide. The Commission drove to each end of the property along the road as well as into the property on the south side on a driveway. It also drove up to a height of land and viewed the property from above. The applicants stated that a large portion of the southern portion of the property was a wetland. The property is much larger than most of the surrounding properties.

Mr. Wiles confirmed that the staff report dated September 26, 2007 was received and no errors were identified.

### Context

The proposal was weighed against the purposes of the Commission as stipulated in section 6 of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* (the "Act"). They are:

1. to preserve agricultural land
2. to encourage farming on agricultural land in collaboration with other communities of interest, and

3. to encourage local governments, first nations, the government and its agents to enable and accommodate farm use of agricultural land and uses compatible with agriculture in their plans, bylaws and policies.

### **Discussion**

#### **Assessment of Agricultural Capability**

Despite the limitations to agricultural development stated in the agrologist report submitted with the application, the Commission believes that the property has agricultural capability and is correctly designated as ALR. It further believes that the property could be developed for agricultural use and that agricultural opportunities for the property have not been fully explored.

#### **Assessment of Agricultural Suitability**

The Commission assessed whether external factors such as encroaching non-farm development have caused or will cause the land to become unsuitable for agriculture. The Commission does not believe there are external factors that render the land unsuitable for agricultural use. Although the property is bordered on two sides by smaller lots, these lots do not extend to the south and west.

#### **Assessment of Impact on Agriculture**

The Commission also assessed the impact of the proposal against the long term goal of preserving agricultural land. The Commission believes the proposal would impact existing or potential agricultural use of surrounding lands and of the subject property. The Commission was concerned about the addition of 44 new lots into this area of ALR in an ad hoc manner in the absence of any comprehensive planning review by the local government. The Commission further notes that it appears that there are non-ALR properties in the general area that could be developed for rural residential uses

### **Conclusions**

1. That the land under application has agricultural capability and is appropriately designated as ALR.
2. That the land under application is suitable for agricultural use.
3. That the proposal will impact agriculture.
4. That the proposal is inconsistent with the objective of the *Agricultural Land Commission Act* to preserve agricultural land.

### **IT WAS**

**MOVED BY:** Commissioner Huffman

**SECONDED BY:** Commissioner Gillette

THAT the application be refused.

### **CARRIED**

**Resolution # 599/2007**